

**HOW YOU
CAN TEACH
ABOUT
COMMUNISM**

DEMOCRACY TALKS BACK

by
RYLAND W. CRARY
and
GERALD L. STEIBEL

"... should make a real contribution
to developing an understanding of
and a defense against Communism."

TEACHERS COLLEGE RECORD,
Columbia University

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

**403 East Franklin Street
Richmond 19, Virginia**

Freedom is more than a word. It is a deeply cherished belief in the essential importance of the person and in the supremacy of a society which respects and safeguards the eminent dignity and integrity of personality.

Freedom is a creative spirit that summons the energies of all men to the task of building the kind of community, the kind of nation, the kind of world in which they want to live. It is a dream of a world in which all men, women, and children are encouraged to grow to their fullest—physically, mentally, spiritually—so that they may fulfill the great promise of their inner potential.

But freedom is more than a belief or a dream. Freedom is also a process; as such it is concerned with means as with ends, seeking through democratic methods to create the good society.

The education of free men to understand their proper role in a free society is basic to such a process. To this task the **FREEDOM PAMPHLET** Series is dedicated.

HOW YOU CAN TEACH ABOUT COMMUNISM

by
RYLAND W. CRARY
and
GERALD L. STEIBEL

Copyright—1951, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH
Printed in the United States of America

FREEDOM PAMPHLETS are edited by Frank N. Trager,
National Program Director of the Anti-Defamation
League, with the assistance of Morton Puner and Joseph
Rosner.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Ryland W. Crary is an associate professor of history at Teachers College, Columbia University, now on leave with the Federal Civil Defense Administration. Dr. Crary has been a high school teacher in Iowa and Illinois for eight years and the author or co-author of many professional articles and teaching materials including "America's Stake in Human Rights," published by the National Council for the Social Studies, "Latin America Faces the Future," and "The Challenge of Atomic Energy." In 1950 he served as official United States Delegate to the UNESCO Seminar on the Improvement of Textbooks held in Brussels.

Gerald L. Steibel, currently on active duty with the United States Army as a psychological warfare officer, has served as a teacher of social studies in the New York City high schools for five years and as an instructor in social science at Teachers College. For the American Council on Education, Dr. Steibel has lectured to groups from many European countries invited here under the ECA's technical assistance program.

PREFACE

Many educators have expressed concern over the lack of a suitable teaching aid for one of our most crucial problems—how to teach about Communism. The editors of the Freedom Pamphlet Series sympathized with them even though at first view a teaching guide seemed too specialized to come within the Freedom Pamphlet publishing formula.

It seemed too specialized — until we saw the manuscript by Ryland Crary and Gerald Steibel. We believe that "How You Can Teach About Communism" is a valid and effective teaching guide. But more, it gets under the skin of some of the major issues confronting the American citizen today. It tells how to understand and answer specious Soviet appeals to the emotions of persons concerned with the problems of the underprivileged and the disinherited. It rips apart the Soviet lie that "if you're not for us you're against us" and, by implication, against all social progress. It offers a social philosophy and stresses an urgent point: only a renewed, intelligent and devoted understanding of democracy can help us survive in an alarmed and troubled world.

We hope that "How You Can Teach About Communism" may serve as your guide to action.

FRANK N. TRAGER
Editor, Freedom Pamphlet Series

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

AN ANALYSIS OF COMMUNISM: THE TWIN ROOTS

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AND PARTY LINES

FIVE QUESTIONS FOR COMMUNISTS

DEMOCRACY'S CHALLENGE

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

INTRODUCTION

You can't teach about democracy unless you can cope with totalitarian propaganda — not with parroted cliches and easy phrases, but with realistic answers, framed in a democratic context.

We've never heard anyone dispute this assumption. But . . .

Few teachers colleges offer any systematic instruction dealing with Russia or Communist ideology. Less than five percent of students graduating from teachers colleges have been enrolled in such courses.

If ignorance was our best defense against Communism, we would be well bolstered indeed. But ignorance is never an answer. If public education is to serve the democracy which produced it, it must provide students with a clear understanding of the realities of the present-day struggle. Teachers must know the facts and know how to teach them.

What are these facts? Primarily, they are those which have to do with Marxism and Russian history, with Russia's resources and political institutions, her cultural and educational life. The public school teacher needs to know the facts which illustrate why Communists are antithetic to the democratic way of life; why Communism has had appeal for hungry, frustrated, or embittered people.

But it is not enough for the teacher to know the facts about Communism, to know about what he is *against*. He must know what he is *for*, and be able to state his knowledge with eloquence and conviction. He must be helped to appreciate and understand the democratic tradition, to know what is meant by free intelligence, free inquiry, free dissent, free choice—all of which are rooted out under Communism. Communism has to be met and defeated on whatever ground it seeks to occupy.

The teacher in a democracy can certainly take the offensive, too. He can ask challenging questions of the Communist, questions such as: "What kind of individual does your authoritarian education produce?" "What is happening to creativity in arts and sciences in Russia?" "Where are your free workers and their right to strike?"

How do we teach these facts effectively in the school program? The primary responsibility will be entrusted, logically, to the field of the social studies. The common course in world history is often a critical point in the social studies curriculum. Today's problem has a world-wide setting and this course should not become merely a history of the western nations. The crisis is a compound of historical causes developing from the rise of national states, from the industrial revolution, from the development of science and technology and from the revolutionary release of great popular energies. This, too, must be taught.

We must recognize that there is too little time to teach all the fascinating lore in the world. We have to omit certain things of lesser historical significance than those events affecting the great crisis of our mid-century. It is simply bad judgment on the part of a history teacher if his students learn a good deal about ancient Egypt and Babylon, and little but a common stock of misapprehensions and errors about modern Russia and China.

The American history course should also include more material to help build understanding of America's role in the mid-twentieth century world. It is critically important that we study our record of foreign relations and understand our attitude toward other peoples and other nations. It is just as important, in American history, that we know what other people have thought of us and our actions at particular periods.

The Problems of Democracy course is naturally most open to the unitary approach. A good course may be arranged about problems in the current world situation. Domestic problems can be studied most effectively in their world setting, in relation to the impact on them of world situations. The problem of inflation today, for example, can hardly be studied apart from the effect upon our economy of our foreign aid and our rearmament program. Human rights problems on the American scene are significant not only as domestic problems and issues. They can best be understood in terms of a broad human struggle for recognition of these rights around the globe.

The struggle for the extension of human rights in this country has become a whipping post for Communists everywhere. In turn, the emergence of Communism has created new dilemmas for the most ardent supporters of equal rights for all.

For a while, one such dilemma was: should the Communist teacher be permitted to teach in American schools? Our answer: obviously not. The bulk of the profession speaking through its great organization, the National Education Association, has declared its belief that the teacher with Communist Party affiliation has no moral right to teach in American schools. This decision, thoughtfully and reluctantly arrived at, stems directly from the peculiar commitments of the Party member. Membership in the Communist Party is not only a political affiliation. It involves actual participation in a great conspiracy against free nations, against democratic institutions themselves.

If Communism constituted a threat in ideas only, we could readily assume that our confidence in the free market of ideas would suffice. But the Communist teacher is a cog in a great power machine, poised and possibly ready for aggressive action. The problem of the Communist teacher can hardly be divorced from the realities of the world situation.

If we are to be unequivocal in defining the Communist teacher out of American education, we must also be alert to necessary safeguards. We recognize that there is much illegitimate definition of Communists in our times—sometimes an hysterical misuse and misapplication of the term. Responsible teachers and citizens must be as alert and outspoken against arbitrary administrative procedures, scapegoating, guilt by casual association, and smear tactics as they are explicit about the unfitness of the Communist Party member to teach.

Our eagerness to define Communist teachers out of the profession should never be motivated by the fear that they will out-teach us. Hamstrung by their party line and peculiar dogmas, Communist teachers are neither intellectual nor pedagogical supermen. Further, the Communist line is not particularly persuasive. Our teachers must understand democracy well enough to be able to teach its specific advantages. And they must always be able to cope with totalitarian propaganda.

The American teacher's task is indeed a difficult one. He must be able to look at the present world struggle in its total setting. He must shun provincial or isolationist attitudes which can set

us apart from our friends and allies. He must try to keep alive a spirit of community among *all* peoples of the world. He must appreciate the terrible nature of another war and at the same time reject both its inevitability and the concept of appeasement or submission to totalitarian domination.

It is a difficult task. But it is a necessary one. It is the kind of job that only a person dedicated to intergroup understanding can perform.

AN ANALYSIS OF COMMUNISM:

The Twin Roots

You can't understand present-day communism without having a background in its twin roots. One root is Russian history. It makes all the difference *where* the seedling is set to grow. The first great experiment in Communism took place in Russia and, inevitably, followed a Russian pattern of tradition and culture.

The second root is Marxism, a doctrine of philosophical Socialism first developed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in the middle of the nineteenth century and further developed by Nikolai Lenin and Josef Stalin during their regimes.

The following analysis is meant to serve as a primer to understanding of these twin roots and how they grew.

I. Russian History

In many areas, the Russian people throughout history have made significant and lasting contributions to world culture. But, there have long been three major and unfortunate characteristics of Russian national life:

Despotism. The tradition of Russian despotism is an old one. From the accession of Czar Michael in 1613, Russian rulers were absolute monarchs until 1917. No experience in democratic practices was possible to the people on any significant scale. Serfdom was legal until 1861 and the power of the lords was never seriously challenged.

Economic backwardness. The worst features of feudal darkness lingered in Russia into the twentieth century. Industry re-

mained undeveloped, agriculture primitive, resources untapped. No middle class arose to force fresh air into the economy. Technology was subordinated to the grabs of the nobility. In this sense, as the Bolsheviks took control, Russia was part of the eastern tradition of wealth for the few, poverty for the many.

Expansionism. The Czars were practising imperialists. Peter the Great in the seventeenth century, Catherine in the eighteenth, and all the other rulers in the nineteenth, devoted large parts of their energies to acquiring land and influence abroad. Poland, Finland, Manchuria, Korea: these were objects of Czarist ambitions and causes for wars long before Soviet Communism started its hot and cold wars. The drive for warm-water ports and the doctrines of "Pan-Slavism" and "Russification," which were surrounded by the Russians with a mystical aura, are examples.

II. The Theory of Marx-Lenin-Stalin

A. MARX AND HIS FOUR BASIC THEORIES:

Economic determinism—"The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence. On the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness." (from "*Critique of Political Economy*")

Class Warfare—"At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production or with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production, these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the period of social revolution." (from "*Critique of Political Economy*")

Historical Necessity—"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles."

— "Hitherto, every form of society has been based . . . on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes."

— "The history of all past society has consisted in the development of class antagonism . . ." (from "*The Communist Manifesto*")

**Surplus Value*—"Into what does the primitive accumulation of capital, i.e., its historical genesis, resolve itself? — It means only the expropriation of the immediate producers, i.e., the dissolution of private property based on the labor of its owner.

"But capitalist production begets its own negation with the inexorability of a law of nature. This does not reestablish private property, but individual property based on the acquisitions of the capitalist era: i.e., on cooperation and the possession in common of the land and the means of production produced by labor itself."

"The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at least reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated." (from "*Das Kapital*")

B. LENIN AND STALIN

Lenin and Stalin attempted to wed Russian tradition to Marxist theory. They both believed in direct action. Lenin's violent methods characterized the desperate resistance to Czarist oppression in pre-Communist Russia. "At the decisive moment," he declared in 1903, "and in the decisive place, you must prove the stronger one, you must be victorious."

He outlined the organization of the Community Party—a type of organization that has been retained until today:

(a) "A small compact core, consisting of reliable, experienced workers, with responsible agents in the principal districts and connected by all the rules of strict secrecy with the organizations of revolutionists . . ."

(b) "Opportunity for open fighting. Opinions expressed. Tendencies revealed. Groups defined. Hands raised. A decision taken. A stage passed through. Forward! That's what I like! That's life!

*A simpler explanation of the theory of surplus value is given in the Freedom Pamphlet, "Primer on Communism."

"According to the theory of surplus value, 1) labor is the sole creator of value; 2) the wages labor receives represent less than the total value it creates; and 3) the value created by labor in excess of its wages, (i.e., the surplus value), is appropriated by the capitalist, who thereby exploits labor. This, according to Marxism, is the root cause of the major inequalities and evils of capitalist society."

It is something different from the endless, wearying intellectual discussion which finished, not because people have solved the problem, but simply because they have become tired of talking."

Despite his avowed dedication to theory, Lenin was, in action, an opportunist. As late as July, 1917, he did not believe that he could seize power in Russia. He opposed the war but sought to turn it into a Civil War. He later permitted capitalism to make a partial return when "pure socialism" led to disaster in Russia.

Lenin applied the revolutionary appeal of Marx to a Russian situation. He utilized the institutions with which Russians were familiar: secret police, Siberian exile, execution of dissidents. He prepared the way for Stalin, who developed the instruments left him by Lenin to new efficiency. Under Stalin, the makers of the revolution were "liquidated," precisely because their kind of rebelliousness was no longer considered a good thing to have around.

Under Stalin, the imperialist drive outward resumed its motion. The rise of the international Communist movement—recruited often from the ranks of blind seekers after social justice—became an effective weapon in Stalin's reach for universal power. Russian influence was again felt in the traditional areas of Czarist ambition: Manchuria, the Balkans, Persia.

In the years after World War II, Stalin gained control of the Eastern European countries of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Albania, as well as the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The Cominform was activated in 1947 to abet this activity and disseminate Communist propaganda throughout the world.

WHAT COMMUNIST THEORY MEANS

We can make certain generalizations from the statements of Marxist theory outlined in the preceding section.

1. Marxian theory is a system of beliefs which, if accepted, make man the creature of things over which he has little or no control. His very consciousness is "determined" by something called "social existence," something which is, apparently, apart from man. Like Fascist doctrine, it makes the individual secondary to the institutions of society.

2. The basis of life, according to Communist theory, is warfare. This not only recognizes that warfare exists; it means that conflict between classes is welcome and desirable. From this view-

point, the cooperative forces of life—such as religion—are obstacles to progress. This is, of course, a direct challenge to our basic democratic belief in peaceful change.

3. History and human experience have but one meaning according to Marxian theory: to bring on more struggle. This means that all life is to be a development of conflict. For example, art, theatre, poetry, novels — all must express the struggle. This is a singularly intense, humorless and anti-humanistic view of life.

4. The Communist says that there can be no compromise within capitalism. The capitalists are the enemies of the workers. There are only two classes, and he who can see more than one side of the argument is naive. Capitalism digs its own grave, and whoever seeks to delay this end works against himself. There can be but one outcome: crisis, misery and deepening resentment until the final explosion. This idea completely ignores or distorts the great record of social progress made in capitalistic, democratic countries.

5. The interplay of economic forces has the characteristics of physical law, says the Marxist. The emphasis is upon inevitability and superhuman force. Man plays a shrunken role. From this concept, degradation of the individual, regimentation, thought control and exploitation of the people inexorably follow.

SUGGESTED READINGS:

- Sidney Hook, *From Hegel to Marx*, N. Y.
Reynal & Hitchcock, 1936.
- George Vernailsky, *A History of Russia*, N. Y.
Yale University Press, new rev. ed. 1945.
- Louis Fischer, *Men and Politics*, N. Y.
Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1941.
- Eugene Lyons, *Assignment in Utopia*, N. Y.
Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1937.

THE REVOLUTION HAS COME FULL-CIRCLE IN RUSSIA

What They Said	What They Did
"Down with the Czarist nobility"	Russia has a new Elite — The Party
"Get Rid of the Military Caste"	Russia has a new military caste in the Red Army—replete with privilege and prestige
"Get Rid of the Czarist police, the Okhrana."	The MVD — formerly the OGPU—is the most terrifying police system of all.
"Put the land into the hands of the peasants."	The land has passed from the hands of the peasants into the collectives.
"We want freedom from censorship and repression."	Russian slave labor camps are filled with men and women whose only crime is honest dissent.
"Religion is the opium of the people. It impedes social progress."	The attack on religion has been transmuted into a new religion — in which Stalin is the demi-god.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AND PARTY LINES

Communist propaganda has been insidious and sometimes effective. It aims to exploit a universal truth: there is always need for improvement in a democratic system—or in any other system devised by man. But the propaganda carefully overlooks another truth about democracy; it is dynamic, constantly working toward its own improvement, shaping itself to the needs of the people.

Throughout the years there have been six basic Communist lines addressed to western democracy. Once we recognize them, we can readily answer them—by pointing out their distortions, errors and downright lies.

1. Social Criticism

What the Communists Say: "We seek out and expose the evils of your system. We probe and publicize injustices so that they may be corrected. We are social critics in the long traditions of radical dissent."

Our Answer: You — the Communists — do try to establish yourselves as legitimate social critics. But you ignore the fact: the function of criticism is improvement — not civil and class warfare.

Because your goal is the overthrow of the capitalist order, you must seize upon any of its inequities to undermine the system. You call attention to the plight of "the Negro" or "the Sharecropper" or "the Worker" as though his plight were the concern of Communists alone. At heart, you have no respect for him—he serves you only as a symbol of "a great day to come."

What happens when your revolutions succeed? What happens then to the submerged elements whom you have championed? To what new estate do the liberated rise under your "dictatorship of

the proletariat?" The Negro is "free," as a Negro; the Sharecropper is released from bondage to the landlord; the Worker casts off his employer. All are now equal—in a common servility. The various captors have been exchanged for a single captor: the Party. Your criticism of the democratic social order has led to a compound from which there is no escape.

There is a kind of criticism other than yours. It is the criticism whose inspiration is derived from a belief in free institutions. Our critics are different from yours. Yours write out of a selfless dedication to a revolution. They praise the men whom tomorrow they damn. They rewrite history, biology, art, music, because the revolution demands it. They rewrite it again and again to comply with current situations. When their goal is reached, they decree an end to all criticism—for what is left to say?

The right to dissent is basic to democracy. We not only tolerate our dissenters, we cherish them. We do this because we believe in the small voice, as well as the large one—the small voice may turn out to be the voice of conscience. We have no faith in the almighty wisdom of single men or small select groups; we prefer the noise of many shouts. We have confidence that out of the hubbub will come constructive action. We provide for criticism to go on and on. We have third parties and "single-taxers" and sometimes we have our demagogues. They all have a voice and we depend upon good education and intelligence to keep them at their proper size.

Your "criticism" is limited to discussion of best ways to serve Stalin or why factory output is not all it should be. You are critical of your enemies, of the "imperialist plotters" and "counter-revolutionary wreckers" and the "Trotskyite Beasts." We, too, are critical of our enemies. But — and this makes the difference — we are also critical of ourselves. We hang no portraits of a Leader in our classrooms. Our popular drama will satirize or poke fun at the foibles of our statesmen. (We've never heard of a Soviet equivalent of "Call Me Madam.") Our children are taught an independence which often verges on the irreverent. While your people goose-step in obedience to commands, ours trudge along out of step.

Yes, we make mistakes. You never do. Our people are encouraged to try again. Yours are liquidated as enemies of the people. We have some hope that our future will be better. Yours

cannot improve since nobody dares suggest that things are not now perfect.

2. Class Struggle

What the Communists Say: The history of the human race is the story of the efforts of the possessors of wealth to exploit the non-possessors in order to make more wealth. It is foolish to expect the wealthy to part peaceably with their riches. Therefore, the non-possessors must conduct warfare in order to secure their due. The owners and their exploited can never be friends. The program of the dispossessed must be warfare and more warfare until final victory is won.

Our Answer: It is true that the common people have often suffered misuse at the hands of the holders of wealth. But it does not follow that class warfare is an answer. Class war does not necessarily lead to a righting of the unbalanced distribution of wealth and power. Too many revolutions in history have merely exchanged one form of slavery for another; the present Stalin regime is a case in point. The function of democratic government is more than that of getting rid of abuses. It involves keeping the administration in power responsible and answerable for its actions, devoted to the job of working for more civil and human rights. Class war carries no guarantee that this problem can be solved. It is destructive and, therefore, of limited use.

Because class war calls for violence as an instrument, it encourages new and continued violence which lasts long after the offending "class enemies" have been exorcised. The means tend to become the ends. The sword, once taken, is permanently wielded. It is too great a temptation for the revolutionary vanguard to identify itself with the revolution per se and to exterminate all those who disagree on grounds of high principle.

A commitment to class warfare has the nature of finality—a finality which rules out the use of the far more potent instrument of human intelligence. It is a decision made in advance of the facts, a decision to slay and deform regardless of what other possibilities of settlement arise. It means that the facts themselves have to be represented always to fit the theory.

The acceptance of class warfare as being natural is based upon an overly simple view of human behavior. In setting up only two classes, the theory imposes an impossible problem for many

persons—exactly where do they “belong?” Where does the worker fit who owns corporation shares or a house? What happens to the farmer who cherishes the ambition to own his own land? What about the white-collar and professional groups who have attributes of “both” classes?

The fact is that modern complex society involves people in a variety of associations. The lines often overlap and make nonsense of the two-class theory.

History reveals a long struggle on the part of the common man for human rights. But history also reveals a slower, less spectacular emergence of intelligent grappling with problems. The trade-union movements in England, France and the United States accomplished more for the “workers” in those countries than class warfare did anywhere in the world.

One last word on the “class struggle.” You preach open “clean” war, but practice deception. You scrape around for explanations of the stubborn refusal of the middle class to be ground to bits, for the peasantry to espouse collectivism joyfully. Your ideals corrode when you have to join with your enemies in wars for survival against even greater enemies. You are captive to your proclamations of class conflict. What is an “imperialist fight” one day becomes a “people’s war of liberation” the next. You cannot admit that you have changed your dogmas, because such an admission might alienate the dogmatic men and women who cling to your banners fearfully. In a world with admittedly tarnished records, yours is the most tarnished, because of its eager trucking with the Fascists and its use of their methods.

3. Social Justice

What the Communists Say: We are the liberators of the oppressed of the world. To the downtrodden and the miserable we bring the hope of relief, a relief founded upon the guarantee that the fruits of labor shall be given to those who perform that labor.

Our Answer: This is a powerful claim. Its appeal is evidenced by the number of downtrodden who have enlisted under your banners, even while ignorant of economics, history and politics. But it is a claim which cannot be substantiated.

Where can you point and say with truth that here you have brought social justice? You cannot claim it within the motherland

of the revolution. Your regime has been at ceaseless war with the body of the peasantry. And these peasants have secured no greater voice in the control of their destinies than they enjoyed under their former masters, the Czars. Your workers are regimented and driven. Not all your recreational and educational improvements can erase the simple fact that their lives are, as always, the expendable coin of the far-away rulers in Moscow.

Your record outside of your homeland is even less enviable. In the Eastern European nations, all life is gradually being subordinated to your world designs. Even the patriotic satisfaction which Russians may enjoy are denied to Bulgarians, Hungarians and Rumanians. The liquidation of old regimes has only resulted in new impositions, this time in the name of your foreign policies. Even within your own borders you deny people an expression of pride in their history; Ukrainians, for example, have been forced to submerge all national feeling.

Your record in Asia is no better. You have willingly used downtrodden millions in wars designed to enhance your own power. In China, your minions have dealt with landlords when expedient; exterminated them when expedient. You brought your commissars and their retinues to Korea, Burma and Indo-China to fasten new tyrannies in place of the old. And you have sent the Chinese peasant, in senseless droves, to be slaughtered by the police forces of the United Nations.

In truth, you expound “social justice” for propaganda proposals only. To you, social justice means the hope of more food, new tax systems, and many grandiose promises. But the fundamental element in social justice—participation by the people in their government and its responsibility to them—is missing.

Our own record of social justice is spotty and contains some gaps. But our objectives are unmistakable. The gains made by our workers and farmers have been permanent. The drive for racial and religious equality within our borders has aimed at precisely those things—and not new disguised controls from above. The liberation of the Philippines, India and the islands of the former Dutch empire in Indonesia has come about slowly. But, now that they are free, we are determined that they shall remain free.

Not all of us are wholeheartedly in favor of social justice. We have our dissenters and bigots. But we make no effort to silence them by death or the concentration camp. Your voice sounds more

nearly unanimous. But we would rather stand on the record of our accomplishments.

Social justice under Communism? We challenge you to name one area which, once occupied, you turned over to the people. We challenge you to explain why, more than a generation after your revolution, you cannot administer your brand of social justice without secret police, mass purges and giant concentration camps.

4. Peace

What the Communists Say:

We stand for peace, you for war.

Our answer: Your campaign to convince the peoples of the world that you are the advocates of peace is a clever one. It appeals to the general deep-rooted fear of war. The response to your Stockholm petitions—with their doves of peace—attests to this fear. There is reason to believe, however, that your pretense cannot carry conviction for long. For one thing, you have the advantage of being geographically close to the centers of conflict while we are far away. This permits you to “withdraw” your troops from occupied countries and to demand that we do likewise. You are well aware, of course, that withdrawal does not mean the same for both. You are always poised to strike both eastward and westward from your homeland, while we are compelled to remain on the spot.

But look at the naked facts.

(a) Following the close of World War II, we and our allies disarmed and demobilized rapidly. You constantly maintained large numbers of men under arms. Had we really been “warmongers,” would we have thrown away so much skill and material?

(b) We have consistently urged that atomic weapons be kept under international control by the only effective method: inspection. You have opposed this plan. You feared the effects of letting the world know the extent to which you were prepared to wage war and the weakness of your economy. When you finally did propose such a plan of inspection, the plan had so many strings attached that we could not, in good conscience, accept it.

(c) While the dove cooed, the vulture swooped. In the shadow of the Red Army, your cohorts seized power in Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Albania. In no case did you dare permit free elections to decide the issues. For a while,

you maintained a facade of local home grown leaders—but behind this facade was the arm of your military. In 1950, you abandoned this pretense when your minions committed an act of open aggression. For this, the United Nations had only one course—the same course which the free world took against Adolph Hitler a decade earlier. The mobilization of the free world under the banner of the United Nations was an inevitable result to the attack in Korea.

(d) You know, as we do, that the United Nations is man's last hope for averting general disaster. Yet you have regarded the U.N. as your sounding-board for propaganda, its machinery as an instrument of confusion. You have made impossible demands at the table of nations. You have abstained from participation in the cultural and social agencies of the U.N. whose work is devoted to lasting amity.

Is this peace? Slowly and reluctantly we have come to the conclusion that there is but one language you respect: force. You refused to negotiate the Berlin grievances, but backed down before the airlift. You urged the Koreans to take a step which brought men of a dozen nations into the line against them. You encouraged the Chinese to make the one move which effectively scuttled the efforts of the British and Indians to get them admitted to the United Nations.

By degrees, the other peoples of the world are being brought to recognize your true intentions. Within your own ranks, your aggressive designs have estranged your supporters in many lands. You may denounce the Titos and the members of the Italian Communist Party who quit in protest but you can depend on more defections from your system.

Your propaganda about British and American warmongers is hollow. Our press tells you that we draft our young men with extreme reluctance, that we commit troops to foreign lands only after long and savage debate.

May we conclude that you are counting upon our hesitation to give you your golden chance to extend your control indefinitely? If this is peace, say that good is evil and truth is falsehood.

5. Human Rights

What the Communists Say:

We speak for the rights of the masses, long submerged and long suffering. Under our regime, these masses will be free

to live as men are made to live.

Our Answer: To find a definition for human rights, you must come to us, because these definitions are a product of the long struggle for man's liberation of which you are in one sense an offshoot. Let us match some of your performances against the well-established meanings of human rights:

Your exaltation of Stalin to godhood is a denial of the humanitarian creed that all men are created equal. The worship of such deities has long since been left behind in our struggle to lift man to dignity and respect.

Your thought control and censorship is contrary to our conviction that men should be free to think for themselves. Your puppet press is worse than the most venal of our own publications. Your herding of millions into slavery and exile bespeaks your belief that only a select few shall think for the rest—a notion which we oppose in our creed.

Your dictation to your scientists, artists, writers is a degradation of the creative spirit. Your parade of sinners reclaimed, enthusiastically admitting their sins, demonstrates your infallibility. We think it marks new lows of human self-abasement.

Your Marshal Zhukov boasts to our General Eisenhower of your disregard for human life. Our General Eisenhower deplores this, because each life is sacred to us, to be spent only in extreme need. Your Lenin spoke of the people as masses to be led; our Jefferson and Lincoln spoke of them as individual personalities to be developed and set free.

Your educational system is constructed to produce obedient servants of your regime. You write and rewrite your textbooks because you dare not let your people know all the facts. In this way, out of fear of free ideas, you become contemptuous of all thinking. You gear your schools for war and teach that political dogma is more sacred than human life. Your purposes in education have little to do with the personalities of those who are to be educated. They have much to do with your reach for world power.

In short, you are using our vocabulary, using it for purposes of confusion. You speak of freedom when your actions show that you have no respect for freedom. We can speak of freedom from fear, but your whole existence is the incarnation of fear. We can work for freedom from want, but you thrive on want, seek it out and turn it to your own purposes. You speak of humanity, but you have

no real confidence in humanity. You attack the religious faiths with which men have lived for centuries.

You ignore the genuine religious values which have led men to seek the spiritual comforts of their churches. Brotherhood has meaning to you only as a regimented mass of faceless people. Your devotion to your own creed has persuaded you that men will sacrifice anything for a meal or a suit of clothes.

We sometimes falter and turn backward in the practice of our beliefs. But our traditions of fairness and respect for human individuality are strong enough to provide us with a conscience. Your regime is dedicated to stamping out conscience.

6. Vitality and Free Institutions

What the Communists Say:

Your free institutions are, in reality, institutions of decadence. In the struggle for the future, the talk and debate of parliamentary procedure must lose out to the organization and efficiency of Party-led systems. Your tolerance of treasonable dissent is proof of your softness. Your kind of living leads to softness and decay; ours leads to strength and greater activity.

Our Answer: You mistake the nature of efficiency. You suppose that because orders are snapped out and obeyed blindly you are "efficient." Actually, your operatives are made to live in mortal fear of failure. Your factory managers are timid about experimenting and your political commissars report what they know their superiors *want* to hear.

But efficiency is not the clicking of heels and the emphatic "Yes, sir." It is the business of getting things done. This means, wide-open argument, at certain stages, because it is only by argument that the resources of many brains and experiences can be tapped.

Despite the Soviet claims to inventing practically everything, the record is clear that the Americans showed the Russians how to build Magnitogorsk, Dnieperstroy, jeeps and B-29's. During the war, the flow of tanks, planes, guns was from America to Russia, not vice versa.

You also misunderstand the meaning of discipline. To you it is, again, the absolute obedience to orders. To us it means a willing determination to take a course of action which is intelligently understood. The person who wants to know "why?" is not a traitor

to us but a contributor. We believe that the best discipline is the discipline of enlightenment, of free men fighting for things they understand and believe in.

Further, you confuse softness with civilized virtues. Yes, we believe in the forty-hour week, because we believe that man was made to enjoy leisure. We think that all men should have time to pursue avocations leading to their spiritual enrichment. But this is not "softness," as others before you have discovered. Our fighting record matches that of any nation, no matter how warlike. You have your Stalingrad, Sevastopol, Leningrad. We have our Bastogne, Guadalcanal and Iwo Jima. We give up butter when guns come first, give it up in a better spirit because we know why.

One of your chief concerns today is that we *are* taking vigorous steps to preserve the things we believe in. Whatever their defects, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact are not marks of softness. If we supply our troops with Coca Cola and cigarettes and good food, it is not *instead of*, but *after* guns, shells and planes. Remember, it is your army, not ours, which needs "political commissars" to check on the loyalty of the fighting men.

You challenge our free institutions because freedom is a word for which you can find no place. Except for propaganda purposes you use it little or not at all. In a way, you are the organization of the refugees from freedom, the frightened men who fear the responsibilities which go with freedom. Your discipline offers comfort to those who would crawl away from the life-struggle. You make a seemingly snug world for such people.

Truth becomes what you want it to be at the moment. To rally your people, you rewrite history to show that Trotsky plotted with your enemies to wreck the revolution. When you want to prove that political habits can be inherited biologically, you substitute Lysenko genetics for Mendelian laws by simple strokes of the pen. When your satellites threaten disruption, you announce new sins of "cosmopolitanism" and the like, and your censors hunt down the guilty in art, poetry and literature.

You do this because basically you don't trust your people. We trust ours. Our history, too, undergoes revision. But the deciding factors are not administration, political policy or dictates of a Party board of strategy. They are new evidence and new understandings. Even our textbooks contain acknowledgments of Soviet accomplishments because we do not feel threatened by them. Like

you, we have our heroes, but the most sacred of them are not immune to rough usage by profane hands. Our library shelves contain volumes which "debunk" every American luminary from Washington to F. D. Roosevelt and every institution from the family to television.

This is what we mean by freedom. Your freedom is freedom to fight and work and die for a debased cause; ours is freedom for the personality to grow. We are proud of our "rich and many-sided personalities." When you grasp the fact that this means enlightened citizens, rather than conforming drones, you will appreciate why our citizenry fights so hard even while it may long for what you call the "soft" life.

SUGGESTED READINGS:

- George S. Counts and Nucia Lodge, *The Country of the Blind*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1949.
- H. R. Trevor-Roper, "Stalin Would Have Liquidated Marx." N. Y. Times Magazine, January 30, 1949.
- George Orwell, *1984* (Available in newsstand edition.)
- F. C. Barghoorn, *The Soviet Image of the United States, A Study in Distortion*, N. Y. Harcourt Brace, 1950.
- David Spitz, "Why Communists Are Not of the Left" Antioch Review, Vol. 1x, No. 4 (Dec. 1949)
- Alice Felt Eyler, *Freedom's Ferment*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, 1945.
- Arthur M. Schlesinger, *The American As Reformer*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1951.
- John Dewey, *Liberalism and Social Action*. N. Y. Putnam's, 1935.
- George S. Counts, *American Education Through the Soviet Looking Glass*, N. Y. Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1951.
- M. S. Handler, "The Cominform, Instrument of the Kremlin" N. Y. Times Magazine, October 9, 1949.
- "The New Pattern of Soviet Aggression." N. Y. Times Magazine, October 1, 1950.

Woodrow Wyatt, "Chaos-Breeders in Southeast Asia."
N. Y. Times Magazine, Apr. 10, 1949.

Garrett Undershill, "Report on the Red Army."
N. Y. Times Magazine, Aug. 14, 1949.

To Secure These Rights, Report of the President's Commission on
Civil Rights, U. S. Government Printing Office.

R. W. Crary and John F. Robinson, *America's Stake in Human
Rights*, Bulletin 24 of the National Council for the Social Studies.
1949.

FIVE QUESTIONS FOR COMMUNISTS

In previous sections we have tried to meet the distortions of Communist propaganda. Now we are concerned with methods of taking the offensive.

Communist society is particularly vulnerable to critical inquiry. You, the American teacher, may find it worthwhile to advance the following five questions—questions which no Communist has ever answered satisfactorily in terms compatible with democratic belief. Lacking these answers, we have tried here to amass evidence to reach our own conclusions.

These questions may serve two purposes: to develop a realistic awareness in your students of the contrast in systems; and to meet the arguments of the misinformed.

I. *A Question for Communists:* In the capitalist democracies, you come forward as leaders of the cause of the workers. At home, you speak of the "workers" and peasants' state." But where are your workers and peasant movements? Where are your trade unions and what are their rights?

The Evidence: We look hard—and still do not find—the equivalent of our Grange, National Farmers Union or Farm Bureau Federation anywhere in Soviet Russia. We know of nowhere on your collectives where the farm operative has the right to make his voice heard on matters that count most—his income and hours of labor. We know of no ways in which the peasant can exert pressure on the powers-that-be in Moscow on such matters as farm policy or crop acreage. The last Russian to advocate such things as

unions and the right to strike was Mikhail Tomsy. He succumbed during the purges of the thirties, branded as a traitor.

To our knowledge, you have no workers' or peasants' organizations of real vitality. You may say that they are not needed, that their needs are taken care of by the men who govern, that they actually "own" the nation. This is subterfuge. The worker whose body aches from the speedup—which you call "Stakhanovism" — will find little comfort in being told that he "owns" the mine in which he toils. The peasant punished for failing to meet requisition quotas will see little practical difference from the old days of the Czarist landlordism.

Our Conclusions: Your statements about worker-peasant revolution would have a sounder ring if we knew that you were offering a better kind of collective bargaining guarantee. In democracy, we don't want the rations of well-kept slaves; we want a participation in the decisions which your policies cannot possibly offer. We have learned to distrust paternalism when it is a basis of all day-to-day living. We have confidence only in freely conducted negotiation and in the sharing of both decisions and consequences.

Outside of the window-dressing of your theories, we cannot see any real difference between the life you offer and that of the individual under Hitler's Labor Front or Mussolini's Corporative State. Your workers and peasants live as drafted animals. There is no machinery for altering their lives, only the wisdom of the Politburo.

II. *A Question for Communists:* You are the self-proclaimed defenders of peace. Yet your huge armaments, your acts of aggression and your continuing obstructionism in the United Nations are acts which can only sabotage that peace. You must know these things; surely, these acts are deliberate, part of a design. Why do you speak of peace and act for war?

The Evidence: Your own great men—your Lenin, Stalin—have proclaimed over and over that any measures necessary to weaken the enemy, sow confusion in his ranks, and divide him against himself, should, and must, be carried out. This talk-for-peace, act-for-war record which you have built up, conforms to these tactics.

Your faithful followers distributed peace petitions even while your equipment carried Chinese and Koreans into a war of aggres-

sion. Your press denounced the defenders of Korean integrity as "warmongers" while your representatives quit United Nations commissions and vetoed all attempts to arrange real peace.

Since the defeat of the Axis powers, you have been unwilling to perform one *act* which would demonstrate that you really wanted peace. You have talked much; against this talk we have only Berlin, the boycott and veto at the United Nations, and Korea by way of action.

Our Conclusions: The peace you seek is the kind of peace you enjoy inside your own borders — the peace of the prisons and the gallows. It is the peace which comes after all your opponents have been silenced. It is the peace which comes only after all your desires have been satisfied, your "revolutions" fomented, your power magnified.

III. *A Question for Communists:* One of your proud boasts is your record in education. You are proud of the provisions in your constitution for education. You point to the growth of literacy in your once almost totally illiterate land. Granted that you have taught large numbers to read and write, that you have spread cultural activities such as theater, ballet and the cinema, the question remains: what kind of *individuals* does your educational system produce?

The Evidence: Your social aims and objectives must color the quality of your teaching methods. You are dedicated to the preservation of what you call "The Revolution." Therefore, it follows that your entire school system is conceived for this single purpose—the education of the kind of person whose loyalty to Party principles and Party leaders will be unquestioned. If this statement of purpose is accurate, "critical thinking" is fore-doomed.

Critical thinking cannot exist where textbooks are written and rewritten in strict accord with the political purposes of the regime in power, where teachers are not free to offer different sides of an issue. It cannot be developed where opposition views are never given a chance to be heard.

You say you carry on much discussion and critical review. This is partly true. Your local Party cell will conduct a debate on the best way of stepping up farm yield, or how "wreckers" are to be detected. But, on the evidence, there is no possibility that anyone, in the course of the forum, will suggest that collective agriculture

is less than the most efficient system or that Politburo planning is faulty.

Our Conclusions: We believe that critical thinking is anathema to your faith; that your educational philosophy is calculated to turn out creatures with "conditioned reflexes" rather than developed powers of judgment. We believe that one of the reasons for your isolation from western currents of thought is the fear that contact will lead to dissatisfaction with your carefully sterilized kind of "training."

This represents a basic distrust of the distinctively human values in people, their powers of independent thought. Your own revolution-makers were the product of free thinking. Having witnessed the awesome power of the intellect to uproot the things that bind it, you appear determined not to let that power be turned against you.

The function of your educational system is precisely the opposite of education in democracy. Here we are concerned with developing each individual to the utmost of his abilities. We teach him *how* to think and *how* to create; not *what* to think and *what* to create. Your system is dedicated to the development of the automaton; the intellectual cipher for anything but your bidding.

IV. *A Question for Communists:* You boast to the world about the accomplishments of your artists and scientists, about your new proletarian culture. The artists and scientists of the western democracies, you proclaim, are not free; they must do the bidding of the "Wall Street financiers," the "imperialist warmongers." We know this is not true—know it from personal observation. But what is happening to creativity in the arts and sciences under your totalitarian domination?

The Evidence: We have seen your published reports of public recantation of political sins by your musicians and writers. According to Marx and his followers, every form of entertainment, from the grand opera to the smallest joke in a cafe must be useful to society and hence must conform to current Communist policy.

You have rewritten the history of invention to "prove" that your people thought of every new advance before all other people. At the moment, Soviet scholars are working on a new edition of the official Soviet Encyclopedia. The encyclopedia's first edition, which took a quarter of a century to prepare, has been proscribed

for "errors" — the new one will "conform."

We have never had the effrontery to claim that all inventions, all art, all drama came from any *one* people. Our scientists have a long tradition of sharing knowledge, our artists have acknowledged their debt to the peoples of all the nations — even including your own. We have been creative partly because we have been able to recognize and honor your Maxim Gorki for his writings, Sergei Eisenstein for his motion pictures, Sergei Prokofieff for his music. You have increasingly claimed that all worthwhile invention and creation — from the airplane to television — is your own.

Our Conclusions: For the healthy exchange of ideas and talents with others, you substitute the sickly worship of your deity, Stalin. You thank him for everything new, everything good. He is your first scientist, your first sculptor, your first dramatist. We don't know how much longer you will be able to depend upon him as a wellspring of inspiration.

Yesterday, Trofim Lysenko was a hero because his theories of genetics fitted your political designs; today there is a strange silence about the man and his theories. Yesterday your playwrights condemned the "enemy;" today, the "enemy" has become the friend and your playwrights are "saboteurs" and "wreckers." We know that creation cannot take place in this sickly atmosphere.

V. *A Question for Communists:* Why do you fear the accomplishments of free men?" brings to mind a whole series of questions embodied in everything that has gone before in this pamphlet. We shall not try to recall the evidence and draw our conclusions here. But the question, "Why do you fear the accomplishments of free men?" brings to mind a whole series of related ones.

William Shakespeare once remarked "Methinks the lady doth protest too much." Analysis of your propaganda strategy reveals that this is an accurate description of a major part of your claims. You ridicule those accomplishments for which you have no use and claim Russian origins for those you find useful. You write off the long history of emerging freedoms in government, in religion, in education, in science. The *products* of these freedoms — speculative philosophy, secular control of civil affairs, tractors, electric power, chemical fertilizers, and that fascinating institution,

revolution — you claim as your very own.

Our next question, therefore, is: How can you claim the fruits of man's freedom for yourselves while denying the worth of that freedom?

The tractor, to use your own valued symbol, could never have been created in a world of iron curtains and regimented thinking. The harnessing of metal to power required that engineers be free to comprehend the laws of matter and energy. Any subservience to political maneuver such as you enforce would have been disastrous to tractor-making. Look at history again and try to read it without your "Stalinist" glasses. Behind those tractors lies a long fight against magic, superstition, ignorance which claimed a divine license to operate.

Another question: Do you imagine that you will enjoy the tractor for long in your unfree climate? Where will you find the creative urge, the search for new and better ways to make the tractor run? In the past, that urge came out of the hard-won liberties of the people. If you dry up those liberties, can you still induce scientists and engineers to think creatively? Can you drive men to think creatively?

We ask, finally, isn't your narrow retreatism a kind of dilemma in which you shut yourselves off from the peoples who believe in freedom. Does it not, on the other hand, compel you to send spies and conspirators to steal the information which you must have? Is it not the mortal fear of free and open contact which compels you to get, for example, atomic intelligence through methods which even you profess to abhor? And is not this technique of theft the tacit admission of the weakness of your case? If your habits of discipline are so well taught, if your "workers' and peasants' republic" compares so favorably with all others, why do you not seize the opportunity to let your people and ours see this for themselves?

You're afraid to take a chance on this kind of freedom, aren't you?

SUGGESTED READINGS:

R. H. S. Crossman, *The God That Failed*, N. Y. Harpers, 1949.

Arthur Koestler, *Darkness at Noon*, N. Y. Macmillan, 1941.

Victor Kravchenko, *I Chose Freedom*, N. Y. Scribner's, 1946.

George S. Counts, *I Want to be Like Stalin*, N. Y. John Day, 1947.

David V. Dallin, *The Real Soviet Russia*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1945.

Communism in Action, 79th Congress, 2nd Session
House Document No. 754, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1946.

DEMOCRACY'S CHALLENGE

Democracy has the sounder argument, the better resources, the stronger morale. A positive assertion of democratic principles is the point to be stressed in teaching about Communism.

The following concepts are basic to democracy. Their understanding contributes to an appreciation of its infinite superiority.

A. THE GREAT TRADITION. Democratic traditions are age-old — not in the sense of an ivy-covered relic — but of tested and selected experience. These are some of the outstanding pages in the long record: the social consciousness of the Biblical Hebrews; the belief in spiritual liberty of the Greeks; the organizing skill of the Romans; the compassion and pity of the Christians; the boldness of the Renaissance scientists; the struggle for breathing room by liberals of the last two centuries.

The appeal of Communist dogma is falsely derived from this Great Tradition. Communist propaganda strikes a responsive chord when it discusses the brotherhood idea, not when it goes into dialectical mazes which few can master. The democrat's task is to do more than just refute these claims; it is to demonstrate that he, not the Communist, is the best agent for making freedom and brotherhood come alive.

The democrat is strongest in advancing this assertion. Behind him is the weight of history. There is, for example, Jefferson's humane tolerance which produced the phrases of the Declaration of Independence, phrases which Americans have constantly worked at implementing. There are the bold ventures into the wilderness of the American Middle Period by the pioneers of New Harmony

and Nashoba, of the Oregon and Santa Fe Trails. In courage and foresight these ventures match anything the Soviets can point to, and they did *not* lead to new slaveries. The lists of the dissenting are extensive: Henry George, Edward Bellamy, the rebellious Thoreau, did *not* have to go into exile to speak their pieces. The imagination and social depth of understanding of the Tennessee Valley Authority at least equals the greatest works in the Soviet Urals. Our historians can speak authentically of a Jacksonian, a Lincolnian, a Rooseveltian revolution. Where are the revolutions leading to social progress in Russia since Stalin?

The democrat need have no fears that he is committed to the defense of the wicked, the outworn, the tired. His part of the world, like all the other parts, has bitterness and injustice. But he has the most effective — indeed, the only effective — means of doing something about it. The protest of the Populist crusade, the protest of the exploited worker in this country became written into corrective law. Where are the protests within the Communist orders?

B. FREE INTELLIGENCE. Because history increasingly supports the hypothesis that man can take care of himself, democracy has come to rest upon the belief in intelligence. This means a system of government in which the voice of the many is made effective. Democracy is not a guarantee; it is a possibility. It does not insure honest or capable or wise government. What it does do is to guarantee that the public may become wise and thus will be able to control its common destinies. The conditions of such wisdom are the conditions of an intelligent public — enlightenment, critical judgment, education. This is what distinguishes democracy from all other forms of rule. Other systems of rule depend upon select cadres — elites — who, for sundry reasons, are most "fit" to rule. These may be reasons of "race," of "natural ability," of Party strategy. Whatever the overt excuse, anti-democratic systems all agree that the wide numbers of ordinary people cannot be entrusted with decision-making power.

Hence, the democratic faith is a faith in education. Other forms believe in "training" — a process of turning out products which look alike and act alike. The stress is upon such things as "obedience," "work," "sacrifice." Only in a democracy can a leading educator say "the aim of education is simply growth and

further growth." Only a people dedicated to democracy would honor such a man; elsewhere he would be purged as a "wrecker."

The principle of growth means the nurture of the human things in people — their capacity to think, to live graciously, to cultivate their aesthetic faculties. The totalitarian sneers at this humanism as "softness," but the democrat understands that it is only the developed, mature individual who can participate in the public wisdom which is the mainstay of functioning democracy.

There is no sentimentalism in this idea. Such education is neither waste nor luxury; it is the most practical education in history. The respect for the individual's personality is one of the things which our Great Tradition has given us. As system after system broke apart, and one elite followed the other into oblivion, the meaning of personality slowly dawned. Now, in the day of exact scientific research, modern knowledge tells us in precise terms what experience had long since begun to point to: that the "average man" is the only "master race."

Others before us had "faith" in man, but they relied upon man's just growing, like Topsy. We have different insights now, insights which are part of our intelligence. Let us review some of the specifics that contribute to free intelligence:

1. *Freedom to Fight Tyranny.* Our traditions of liberalism point up our fight to cast off ancient and outworn fetters. We keep governmental powers at the point where the officials cannot succumb to the temptation to play God or King.

2. *Free Inquiry.* We use this freedom to search for solutions to problems. These solutions are based upon good consequences and not someone's pet dogmas.

3. *Free Dissent.* In order to keep inquiry from becoming lax or self-congratulatory, we protect our dissenters well. If intelligence is to function properly, the dissenter must have the standing opportunity to make his beliefs known. Truth, as Justice Holmes put it, must always get itself accepted in the marketplace of free thought.

4. *Free Choice.* Free intelligence depends upon free choice. People must have the right to review the alternatives on all questions. To have this right, they need an education which sees all

sides of all issues. They need a freedom of speech and press for all aspects of issues to be openly presented. They need an electoral system which permits an unsupervised selection of candidates.

C. *Democratic Concern for Material Well-Being of the Individual.* Some blood and many words have been spilled over the term "materialism." But only democracy makes sensible use of the idea.

Democracy must be concerned with the material well-being of the individual. It holds that its beliefs cannot be realized in a world of poverty, physical degradation and insecurity. A world which neglects sound houses, nourishing food and financial security is a world dedicated to terror and eternal night—not to God or to things "spiritual." Therefore, democracy talks about *and builds* — houses, playgrounds, hospitals. It talks about — *and guarantees by law* — union organization, job rights, pensions and old-age security. It is obligated to feed the hungry, care for the ill and feeble.

Democracy can boldly affirm its concern for material well-being because its ultimate purposes are not essentially materialistic. Our educational thinking is directed to the development of personality; our highest values are those of peace, leisure and the civilized arts. We are neither "materialistic" nor "spiritual," but both. Each depends upon the other; only the sworn enemy of democracy finds it necessary to make the separation. We know that man's material well-being comes from the peaceful pursuit of labor, his spiritual well-being from his dedication to good.

D. *Human Rights.* Too often, the democrat finds himself in the "middle" of a supposed "left-right" alignment. He finds himself the scorn of both extremes. He thinks of himself as "neither radical nor reactionary" but is uncertain as to how to classify himself.

He doesn't have to. If he takes a strong positive stand, he will find his place remarkably clear.

The old left-right thinking has lost whatever vitality it once had—if we define Communists as being of the left. When we take up the significant fact that the Soviet revolution has come full-circle, the alignment changes completely. The police state, censorship, forced labor on farm and factory, rule by the Party elect: these add up to a close resemblance between Communism

and Fascism, vanquished or thriving. Concentration camps look the same wherever they are built. On more than one occasion, Communists found it desirable to cooperate with Fascists: in Germany in 1932, in Germany again in 1939, in Germany today. Consider, further, that the only groups with consistent records of opposition to both the Red and Brown terrors are to be found in the camp of the "middle" democrats, and the direction becomes clear.

The dividing issue is not "capitalism versus communism" but simply that of human rights. There are large elements of collectivism within capitalism. There are equally large amounts of capitalist practice within the communist state. The terms themselves have little value as measuring-rods. But there is no doubt concerning the question of human rights. Either one believes wholeheartedly in the rights of all humans everywhere, or he opposes those rights for all people. In the first case, he is a radical—in the finest sense, the sense in which Jefferson and Sam Adams were radicals. In the second case, he is reactionary, or whatever label is most expressive.

The test is not in words alone. If men are sent to exile or death for dissent, if they labor at tasks in whose choice they had no say, if they die of starvation and neglect, those responsible are foes of humanity. Whether they wear brown or red or white shirts makes no difference; they are the enemies of democracy wherever they appear.

The Communist proclaims that he has the cure-all for the ills of mankind. We know this is demonstrably false. But we recognize that there *are* weaknesses and that somehow they must be cured. Many great forces and institutions are working at this job, working within a democratic framework. Because they are working towards these ends — and because Communists speciously and loudly proclaim that they are working toward the same purposes—the democratic institutions have sometimes been smeared and abused by the mercenary or ignorant "Communist-hater."

On the other hand, a recent survey conducted by the New York Times and reported in its issue of May 10, 1951 showed evidence of a major hazard in fighting communism. A study of seventy-two major colleges indicated that many members of the college community were wary or afraid to speak out on controversial issues, afraid to discuss unpopular concepts, afraid to participate in

student political activity. The primary reasons for this subtle, creeping paralysis of freedom of thought and speech, the survey reported, were: (1) Social disapproval; (2) A "pink" or "communist" label falsely and irresponsibly applied; (3) Criticism by regents, legislatures and friends.

These limitations of freedom of inquiry take a variety of forms. Their net effect, the newspaper reported, is a widening tendency toward passive acceptance of the status quo, conformity, and a narrowing of the area of tolerance in which students, faculty, and administrators feel free to act, speak, and think independently.

This limitation of intellectual freedom—for all citizens as well as the college community—is a by-product of the world-wide Communist assault. But it is a by-product that we ourselves have fashioned from an excess of fear and blind hatred.

The teacher must be courageous and wise in overcoming these pitfalls and hazards. And he must be firm in his belief that for the practicing democrat there is no middle road between good and evil. His ideology is the ideology of the rights of all men, the rights which he knows are sound expressions of the best in experience. His co-workers are free men everywhere; his party is the community which is natural to men. His weapons are intelligence, confidence and knowledge. His resources are the vast findings of science together with the great diary of the human race—a diary filled on each page with the search for the true, the beautiful, and the good.

SUGGESTED READINGS:

Ralph Henry Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought*, N. Y.
Ronald, 1940.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., *The Vital Center*,
Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1949.

Richard Hofstadter, *The American Political Tradition and the Men Who Made It*, N. Y., Knopf, 1948.

Robert M. MacIver, *The Ramparts We Guard*
N. Y. Macmillan, 1950.

Paul Hoffman, *Peace Can Be Won*, N. Y.
Doubleday, 1951.

David Lilienthal, *This I Do Believe*, N. Y.
Harper, 1949.

John L. Childs, *Education and Morals*, N. Y. Appleton Century-
Crofts, 1950.

Partners in Progress. A Report to President Truman by the Inter-
national Development Advisory Board., N. Y.
Simon and Schuster, 1951.

Fortune Editors, U.S.A., *The Permanent Revolution*
Prentice Hall, N. Y.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES FOR CLASSROOM OR DISCUSSION GROUP

I. Sociodrama

A. Stage a situation in which a trial is being conducted according to Russian totalitarian standards. Assume that the accused is on trial for "selling military information to an enemy." These roles might be assigned:

1. The prosecutor.
2. The accused — a worker in a tractor factory.
3. The factory manager.
4. Agent of the secret police.
5. The judge.
6. The witnesses, including the neighbors, wife and children of the accused, the local secretary of the Communist Party.

It should be clear that the indictment includes disloyalty to the party line. The highlight of the trial is the accused's "confession."

After the trial, certain questions should be useful for discussion purposes:

1. Why was the defendant guilty before ever coming to trial?
2. How did the trial ignore the basic legal safeguards which are standard in every American trial?
3. What made the children turn against their father?

B. This situation is in a Russian schoolroom. The time is shortly after World War II. This is a class in history, and it has been studying the war. During the war, the U.S. had been dealt with in a fairly friendly way as a military ally. Now, in yesterday's

Pravda, the entire front page has been given over to a slashing attack upon "American-British imperialist warmongering." These roles might be assigned:

1. Each child becomes, automatically, a Russian child.
2. The teacher—a classroom dictator.
3. The teacher's immediate supervisor — a bureaucrat.
4. One or two children who seem to have difficulty in changing their minds so rapidly and who ask embarrassing questions.

Questions for discussion after the sociodrama:

1. Which type of teacher would you prefer to have, the American or the Russian?
2. Were the children truly convinced of the truths of the new Russian policy? What other agencies in Russian society would be at work re-educating the children and their parents?
3. Discuss and contrast the Russian and American systems of education.

C. This takes place at the European track-meet in Brussels. A group of Russian athletes are discussing what they have seen and heard on this, their first journey outside Russia. These are the roles which might be assumed:

1. The boy from Moscow, who defends the Party line all the way.
2. The peasant lad from the Volga who is bewildered by the material prosperity he has witnessed.
3. The teacher from a country school whose faith in the Soviet enterprise is visibly shaken, and who has secretly decided he is not going back to Russia with the team.
4. The former aviator whom all suspect of being an agent of the secret police.
5. The former employee of the American Embassy in Moscow who has long dreamed of a chance to escape and now sees his opportunity near at hand.

Questions for discussion after the socio-drama:

- a. Do you really think such a discussion situation would develop among a group of Russians?
- b. What reactions do you think a Russian would have if he really got to see an American city?

II. Topics For Group Discussions:

1. Soviet methods of thought control.
2. The Russian system of justice.
3. Soviet radio, movies and books.
4. Relationships in Russia among students, parents, teachers.

III. Topics For Individual Investigation and Reports:

1. Russian line on international control of atomic energy.
2. The Party line on the Korean War. (See U.N. reports, speeches of Malik, Gromyko, et al).
3. The accomplishments of the Marshall Plan.
4. The UN's stand on aggression.
5. How the Point Four program works.
6. America's responsibilities in the Atlantic Pact.

IV. Group Work:

1. Prepare a newspaper reporting a day's events in the Russian manner, including front-page, editorials, sports column, etc.
2. Have prepared the following imaginary letters and messages:
 - a. From the Chinese Communist Commander to his armies just prior to the Korean intervention.
 - b. From the same commander to Mao Tse-Tung following the collapse of the latest Chinese-Korean offensive.
From a Russian intelligence agent in New York to his headquarters in Moscow reporting on American feelings about the troops leaving to serve under General Eisenhower in Europe.

GENERAL AREAS FOR DISCUSSION

1. How do the major competing ideologies—democracy, communism, fascism—differ with regard to government, religious liberty, individual opportunity?
2. What is the "Bill of Rights"? What would happen to these rights if America became communistic?

3. What are the fundamental democratic principles that underlie American life? Are these fully understood, accepted, used? Communists say they too believe in and practice these principles. What evidence is there to prove or disprove that claim?
4. How will American life improve as we move into a more complete practice of such principles as the worth and integrity of every human being?
5. What is the nature of the job that faces each of us in the world-wide struggle between communism and democracy?
6. How will a more complete practice of democratic principles help us to win the fight against communism?
7. To what danger signals should we be alert (rumors, witch hunts, loyalty oaths, etc.) and how should we deal with them?
8. Why is membership in the Communist Party different from belonging to an ordinary political party?
9. Would we gain any advantage by refusing to allow Americans to read Russian books, listen to Russian music, or see Russian movies?
10. What kind of record of cooperation with the United Nations does Soviet Russia have?
11. What is the United States doing to prove to the world that democracy is superior to communism?

GENERAL SUMMARY QUESTIONS

1. Along with "rights" go responsibilities. What are the individual's responsibilities and how can they be exercised so as to safeguard his own rights and the rights of other people?
2. Why should we be concerned about protecting the freedom and liberty of people in our country, whom we personally do not know?
3. What is the nature of the struggle between communism and democracy that threatens civilization?
4. Discuss, for purposes of comparison, the political, economic, and cultural rights of Americans and Russians.

FREEDOM PAMPHLETS

NOW AVAILABLE

PEOPLES OF THE SOUTHWEST: Patterns of Freedom and Prejudice, by
W. HENRY COOKE.

AMERICAN EDUCATION UNDER FIRE, by ERNEST O. MELBY.

THE RESPONSIBILITY IS OURS: The Individual and Our Human Relationships,
by BONARO W. OVERSTREET.

DANGER IN DISCORD: Origins of Anti-Semitism in the United States, by OSCAR
and MARY F. HANDLIN.

THE RADIO LISTENER'S BILL OF RIGHTS, by CHARLES A. SIEPMANN.

ABC'S OF SCAPEGOATING: Revised Edition, by GORDON W. ALLPORT.

MODERN EDUCATION AND BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS, by WILLIAM
H. KILPATRICK.

CIVIL RIGHTS: Barometer of Democracy, by EDWARD J. SPARLING.

UNESCO IN FOCUS, by JAMES L. HENDERSON.

THE SCHOOL-CENTERED COMMUNITY, by S. E. TORSTEN LUND.

HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE THEATRE, by JOHN GASSNER.

SHALL CHILDREN, TOO, BE FREE? by HOWARD A. LANE.

AMERICA'S NEEDS AND RESOURCES, by CHARLES E. LINDBLOM.

GROUP DYNAMICS AND SOCIAL ACTION, by KENNETH D. BENNE.
LELAND P. BRADFORD and RONALD LIPPITT.

HOW DO YOU TALK ABOUT PEOPLE? by IRVING J. LEE.

THE NEGRO IN POSTWAR AMERICA, by ARNOLD M. ROSE.

PRIMER ON COMMUNISM, prepared by ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF
B'NAI B'RITH

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

National Commission

HON. MEIER STEINBRINK, *Chairman*

Honorary Vice-Chairmen

BARNEY BALABAN
A. G. BALLENGER
PHILLIP W. HABERMAN

A. C. HORN
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
CHARLES W. MORRIS

DONALD OBERDORFER

Vice-Chairmen

HAROLD LACHMAN

JEFFERSON E. PEYSER

EDMUND WATERMAN

RICHARD E. GUTSTADT
Executive Vice-Chairman

JACOB ALSON
Treasurer

BENJAMIN R. EPSTEIN
National Director

LEONARD L. ABESS, *Miami, Fla.*
JACOB ALSON, *New York, N. Y.*
I. B. BENJAMIN, *Los Angeles, Cal.*
MRS. JOSEPH S. BERENSON,
Brooklyn, N. Y.
MAURICE BISGYER, *Washington, D. C.*
WILLIAM P. BLOOM, *Tuscaloosa, Ala.*
JOSEPH COHEN, *Kansas City, Kansas*
MAURICE N. DANNENBAUM,
Houston, Texas
AARON DROOCK, *Detroit, Mich.*
HENRY EPSTEIN, *New York, N. Y.*
FRANK GARSON, *Atlanta, Ga.*
WILLIAM M. GERBER, *Philadelphia, Pa.*
MAURICE A. GOLDBERG, *Washington, D. C.*
EDWARD GOLDBERGER, *New York, N. Y.*
FRANK GOLDMAN, *Lowell, Mass.*
FRANK R. S. KAPLAN, *Pittsburgh, Pa.*

PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK, *Chicago, Ill.*
HAROLD LACHMAN, *Chicago, Ill.*
HERBERT LEVY, *Chicago, Ill.*
DAVID H. LITTER, *New York, N. Y.*
BERNARD NATH, *Chicago, Ill.*
SAMUEL H. NERLOVE, *Chicago, Ill.*
JEFFERSON E. PEYSER, *San Francisco, Cal.*
DAVID A. ROSE, *Boston, Mass.*
PAUL SAMPLINER, *New York, N. Y.*
BENJAMIN SAMUELS, *Chicago, Ill.*
MELVIN H. SCHLESINGER, *Denver, Colo.*
MAX J. SCHNEIDER, *New York, N. Y.*
MEIER STEINBRINK, *Brooklyn, N. Y.*
JESSE H. STEINHART, *San Francisco, Cal.*
MRS. M. A. TEMERSON, *Tuscaloosa, Ala.*
JOHN J. UNTERMANN, *Newark, New Jersey*
EDMUND WATERMAN, *New York, N. Y.*
MRS. HYMAN C. WEISMAN, *St. Louis, Mo.*
LOUIS ZARA, *Chicago, Ill.*

National Staff Directors

OSCAR COHEN	ARNOLD FORSTER	J. HAROLD SAKS	FRANK N. TRAGER
<i>Community Service</i>	<i>Civil Rights</i>	<i>Administration</i>	<i>Program</i>

National Program Committee

HAROLD LACHMAN, *Chairman,*
Chicago, Ill.
DAVID H. LITTER, *Vice-Chairman,*
New York, N. Y.
HARRY ALPERT, *Alexandria, Va.*
A. G. BALLENGER, *Chicago, Ill.*
SAMUEL E. BINSWANGER, *Richmond, Va.*
FRANKLIN BRUCK, *New York, N. Y.*
SAMUEL DALSIMER, *New York, N. Y.*
HENRY EPSTEIN, *New York, N. Y.*
HAROLD S. GOLDBERG, *Boston, Mass.*
HARRY GOLDBERG, *New York, N. Y.*
ALEX M. LEWYT, *Brooklyn, N. Y.*
EDWARD MILLER, *Denver 2, Colo.*

STANLEY MOSK, *Los Angeles, Cal.*
BERNARD NATH, *Chicago, Ill.*
SAMUEL H. NERLOVE, *Chicago, Ill.*
JEFFERSON E. PEYSER, *San Francisco, Calif.*
BRUNO W. RANDOLPH, *New York, N. Y.*
WILLIAM R. ROSENBLUM, *New York, N. Y.*
WILLIAM SACHS, *New York, N. Y.*
PAUL SAMPLINER, *New York, N. Y.*
D. G. SCHNEIDER, *Chicago, Ill.*
JESSE H. STEINHART, *San Francisco, Cal.*
MRS. HYMAN C. WEISMAN, *St. Louis, Mo.*
LOUIS WIRTH, *Chicago, Ill.*
LOUIS ZARA, *Chicago, Ill.*

FREEDOM PAMPHLETS — ORDER FORM*
ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

Publications Department

212 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

Please send me.....additional copies of HOW YOU
CAN TEACH ABOUT COMMUNISM, by Ryland W. Crary and
Gerald L. Steibel.

Copies of the above pamphlet cost twenty-five cents each.

Also send me the following *Freedom Pamphlets* already published:
(25c per copy) PRIMER ON COMMUNISM

prepared by Anti-Defamation League of B'nai
B'rith.....copies

** (25c per copy) PEOPLES OF THE SOUTHWEST:

Patterns of Freedom and Prejudice,

by W. Henry Cooke.....copies

** (25c per copy) AMERICAN EDUCATION UNDER FIRE

by Ernest O. Melby.....copies

** (25c per copy) THE NEGRO IN POSTWAR AMERICA

by Arnold M. Rose.....copies

** (25c per copy) HOW DO YOU TALK ABOUT PEOPLE?

by Irving J. Lee.....copies

** (25c per copy) GROUP DYNAMICS AND SOCIAL ACTION

by Kenneth D. Benne, Leland P. Bradford

and Ronald Lippitt.....copies

** (25c per copy) AMERICA'S NEEDS AND RESOURCES

by Charles E. Lindblom.....copies

** (25c per copy) SHALL CHILDREN, TOO, BE FREE?

by Howard A. Lane.....copies

(25c per copy) HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE THEATRE

by John Gassner.....copies

** (25c per copy) THE SCHOOL-CENTERED COMMUNITY

by S. E. Torsten Lund.....copies

** (25c per copy) UNESCO IN FOCUS

by James L. Henderson.....copies

** (25c per copy) CIVIL RIGHTS: Barometer of Democracy

by Edward J. Sparling.....copies

** (25c per copy) MODERN EDUCATION AND BETTER

HUMAN RELATIONS

by William H. Kilpatrick.....copies

(25c per copy) ABC'S OF SCAPEGOATING

by Gordon W. Allport.....copies

(25c per copy) THE RADIO LISTENER'S BILL OF RIGHTS

by Charles A. Siepmann.....copies

(25c per copy) DANGER IN DISCORD

by Oscar and Mary F. Handlin.....copies

** (25c per copy) THE RESPONSIBILITY IS OURS

by Bonaro W. Overstreet.....copies

Enclosed please find check or money order for \$.....

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

*For prompt handling please address your request for these pamphlets to the nearest
ADL regional office in your area. See listing on reverse side.

**Published in cooperation with the American Education Fellowship.

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

212 FIFTH AVENUE
327 S. LA SALLE STREET

NEW YORK 10, N. Y.
CHICAGO 4, ILL.

ATLANTA REGIONAL OFFICE, 11 Pryor Street, S.W., Suite 305, Atlanta 3, Georgia
Arthur J. Levin, Director

B'NAI B'RITH DISTRICT NO. 3, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE COMMITTEE OFFICE,
1831 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa., *Blanche B. Eisenstein, Director*

CONNECTICUT REGIONAL OFFICE, 125 Temple Street, Room 510, New Haven 11,
Connecticut, *Hyman H. Hayes, Director*

FLORIDA REGIONAL OFFICE, 330 Seybold Building, Miami 32, Florida, *Gilbert J. Balkin, Director*

ILLINOIS REGIONAL OFFICE, 206 East Adams Street, Springfield, Illinois, *Ben-Zion Emanuel, Director*

METROPOLITAN NEW YORK REGIONAL OFFICE, 20 West 40th Street, New York 18,
New York, *Lester J. Waldman, Director*

MICHIGAN REGIONAL OFFICE, 602 Park Avenue Building, Detroit 26, Mich.
Haskell L. Lazere, Director

MIDWEST REGIONAL OFFICE, 327 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 4, Illinois *A. Abbot Rosen, Director*

MOUNTAIN STATES REGIONAL OFFICE, 220 Empire Building, Denver 2, Colorado
Michael L. Freed, Director

NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL OFFICE, 68 Devonshire Street, Boston 9, Massachusetts
Sol Kolack, Director

NEW JERSEY REGIONAL OFFICE, 1060 Broad Street, Room 549, Newark 2, New
Jersey, *Oscar Groner, Director*

NEW ORLEANS REGIONAL OFFICE, 5342 St. Charles Ave., New Orleans 15, Louisi-
ana, *Brant Coopersmith, Director*

NORTH CAROLINA-VIRGINIA REGIONAL OFFICE, 403 East Franklin Street, Room
307, Richmond 19, Virginia, *Theodore Freedman, Director*

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL OFFICE, 110 Sutter Street, Suite 706, San
Francisco 4, California, *Stanley S. Jacobs, Director*

OHIO-KENTUCKY REGIONAL OFFICE, 82 North High Street, Suite 610, Columbus
15, Ohio, *Seymour Gorchoff, Director*

PACIFIC-SOUTHWEST REGIONAL OFFICE, 2511 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 3, Los Angeles
5, California, *Milton A. Senn, Director*

PENNSYLVANIA REGIONAL OFFICE, 212 North Third Street, Harrisburg, Penn-
sylvania, *Fred Grossman, Director*

PLAINS STATES REGIONAL OFFICE, 338 Securities Building, Omaha, Nebraska,
Joseph F. Kauffman, Director

SOUTHERN OFFICE, 11 Pryor Street, S.W., Suite 305, Atlanta 3, Georgia, *Alexander
F. Miller, Director*

WASHINGTON, D.C., REGIONAL OFFICE, 1003 K Street, N.W., Washington 1, D.C.,
Herman Edelsberg, Director

WASHINGTON STATE REGIONAL OFFICE, 1803 Smith Tower, Seattle 1, Washing-
ton, *P. Allen Rickles, Director*

WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS REGIONAL OFFICE, 172 Chestnut Street, Springfield 3,
Mass., *Thelma Keitlen, Director*

WESTERN NEW YORK STATE REGIONAL OFFICE, 308 Crosby Building, Buffalo 2,
New York, *Israel H. Moss, Director*

WESTERN REGIONAL OFFICE, 502 Pacific Building, Portland 4, Oregon, *David
Robinson, Director*

WISCONSIN-UPPER MIDWEST REGIONAL OFFICE, 500 Madison Building, 623 North
Second Street, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin, *Sidney H. Sayles, Director*

MINNESOTA-DAKOTAS COMMUNITY CONSULTANT, 806 Lumber Exchange
Building, Minneapolis 2, Minnesota, *Monroe Schlactus*

JOINT OFFICES

INDIANA JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL, 401 Liberty Building, 107
South Capitol Avenue, Indianapolis 4, Indiana, *Louis B. Greenberg, Director*

JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER KANSAS CITY, 425 New York Life
Building, 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City 6, Missouri, *Sidney Lawrence,
Director*

SOUTHWESTERN REGIONAL JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL, 1003
Scanlan Building, Houston 2, Texas, *S. Thomas Friedman, Director*

**FREEDOM
PAMPHLETS**

25c

PER COPY

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH
212 FIFTH AVENUE
327 S. LA SALLE STREET

**NEW YORK 10, N. Y.
CHICAGO 4, ILL.**